STVDIA
HVMANITATIS

JOURNALS SH JOURNALS' GUIDELINES FOR GENERATIVE AI USAGE

ACCEPTABLE AND UNACCEPTABLE CASES

Scenario	Identified editorial risk	Institutional decision	Required action
Listing AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini) as author or co-author of a manuscript	Inability to attribute intellectual, ethical, and legal responsibility	Unacceptable	The manuscript must be corrected by removing AI tools from the author list before the editorial process may proceed
Citing an AI tool as the author of a bibliographic reference	Incorrect attribution of authorship and lack of academic accountability	Unacceptable	AI may be mentioned as a tool or methodological resource but not as an author
Use of AI for spelling, grammar, punctuation, or stylistic correction of text written by the author	Minimal risk to intellectual content	Acceptable	No disclosure required if limited to minor linguistic correction
Use of AI to substantially reorganise or reformulate arguments, sections, or interpretations of the manuscript	Risk of loss of genuine intellectual authorship	Conditionally acceptable	The use of the AI tool and its function must be explicitly disclosed
Use of AI to generate entire sections of the manuscript without critical author oversight	Risk of lack of originality, factual errors, or bias	Unacceptable	The manuscript may be rejected for non-compliance with editorial policy

https://studiahumanitatis.eu/ | **March 2026**

Scenario	Identified editorial risk	Institutional decision	Required action
Use of AI to identify potentially relevant scholarly literature	Moderate risk of fabricated or inaccurate references	Acceptable with supervision	Authors must manually verify all references
Inclusion of references generated by AI without verification	Risk of fabricated or non-existent citations	Unacceptable	Mandatory correction prior to editorial evaluation or rejection
Use of AI in data analysis or modelling as part of the research design	Risk of lack of reproducibility if not documented	Acceptable	Must be described in detail in the methodology section
Use of AI in interpretation of results without methodological documentation	Lack of transparency and reproducibility	Unacceptable	The article must include detailed methodological explanation
Explicit declaration of AI use (tool name, version, purpose)	Ensures transparency and methodological traceability	Acceptable and recommended	Include disclosure in methodology or a dedicated section
Failure to disclose AI use in substantive research or writing tasks	Lack of editorial transparency	Unacceptable	Mandatory correction or possible rejection
Technical adjustments to images (brightness, contrast, colour balance) without altering scientific information	Minimal risk	Acceptable	Original information must remain intact
Use of AI to generate or alter scientific images representing research results	Potential distortion of scientific evidence	Unacceptable	Manuscript may be rejected or investigated
Use of AI to generate illustrative figures when the article explicitly studies AI technologies	Moderate risk if not disclosed	Conditionally acceptable	The image must clearly indicate that it was AI-generated
Use of AI to produce graphical abstracts or editorial artwork	Risk related to copyright and authenticity	Generally not permitted	Allowed only with prior editorial authorisation

Scenario	Identified editorial risk	Institutional decision	Required action
Uploading unpublished manuscripts into public AI systems	Risk of breaching confidentiality and intellectual property	Unacceptable	May constitute an ethical breach
Uploading personal or sensitive data into AI tools	Risk of violating privacy and data protection regulations	Unacceptable	Strictly prohibited
Reviewer uploading a manuscript into an AI tool for evaluation	Breach of peer-review confidentiality	Unacceptable	Reviewer may be removed from the review process
Reviewer using AI to edit their report by uploading confidential content	Risk of disclosure of confidential information	Unacceptable	Prohibited under editorial policy
Reviewer independently preparing their evaluation report	Ensures expert and independent judgement	Acceptable	Expected scholarly practice
Editor using external AI tools to determine acceptance or rejection	Improper delegation of editorial judgement	Unacceptable	Editorial decisions must be made by human editors
Use of institutional AI tools for technical screening (plagiarism detection, submission completeness)	Low risk with human oversight	Acceptable	Editorial supervision must be maintained
Editorial use of AI for ancillary content (key points, lay summaries)	Limited risk if human oversight exists	Acceptable	Human editorial review required
AI-generated content presented as human scholarly analysis	Misrepresentation of intellectual authorship	Unacceptable	Possible rejection or correction
AI generation of images depicting real individuals, brands, or copyrighted material	Legal and intellectual property risks	Unacceptable	Mandatory removal

Scenario	Identified editorial risk	Institutional decision	Required action
Responsible AI use as a supporting tool under human supervision	Consistent with contemporary academic practice	Acceptable	Transparency and human oversight required

* The use of artificial intelligence in the process of academic research, writing, or publication is permissible only when it functions as an auxiliary tool subordinate to human judgement, does not compromise intellectual originality, respects the confidentiality of the editorial process, protects copyright and data privacy, and is declared transparently when its intervention is substantive.

In all cases, authors, reviewers, and editors retain full responsibility for the published content, including verifying the accuracy of the information, the integrity of the data, and the legitimacy of the sources used.